

February 24, 1993

To: Commission Members

From: Subcommittee on Executive Director Selection

1. On February 8, 1993 the Subcommittee, along with the Interim Director and Eileen Bitten of the Contra Costa Personnel Department, met in Brentwood to discuss a search protocol for the selection of the Executive Director of the Delta Protection Commission.

2. It was agreed that the first task was crafting an adequate Job Description for the position. Ms. Bitten and Mr. Sargent agreed to draft such a description (enclosed see proposed draft).

3. Based on comments from the January meeting, it was agreed that a suitable ad should be placed in the three major papers covering the Delta area, namely: San Francisco Chronicle, Sacramento Bee, and the Stockton record. Additionally, the ad should be placed in two or three professional planning journals.

4. With the time constraints placed upon the Commission to adopt a resource management plan by July 1, 1994, it was suggested that the Commission plan on voting on an Executive Director by its April meeting. In order to meet that deadline the following are suggested time frames

(a) Ads to begin running February 28th in Sunday editions;

(b) Deadline for applications to be received, in Interim Director's office, by no later than March 19, 1993;

(c) First screening to be completed by April 2, 1993;

(d) Final selection to occur at April meeting.

5. It is suggested that as to Salary, the ad specify "salary to be negotiated" rather than a specified range.

6. Eileen Bitten advised that the cost to the Commission, in the event the Commission decides to have the Contra Costa Personnel Department act as facilitator for the search, could either be a fixed sum (i.e. \$3,000 to \$4,000 depending on the extent of work required) or on a time and materials basis. In the event Contra Costa Personnel was to do the preliminary work for the Commission (i.e. drafting the ad, placing such ads, receiving the applications), it was recommended that the Personnel Department do a "first cut" on the initial applications by screening out those who are obviously unqualified for the position (based on the criterion used in the job description). It is the recommendation of the Subcommittee that whoever performs the task of screening those

applicants not qualified in the judgment of the screening agent that Commission members be able to access such rejected applications & have the right to have such applications reviewed by the Subcommittee charged with the responsibility of making the final recommendations.

7. It was the thought of the Subcommittee that a final list of 5 to 10 applicants be recommended to the Commission by the screening Subcommittee. That the final process (if permissible under state law) be set up in such a fashion so that all Commission members could interview the applicants in 2-member subcommittees, by rotating the 2-members subcommittees in and out of different interview rooms where the finalists would be situated.

8. Although the Subcommittee considered placing the ads for the Exec Director prior to the February meeting, due to holidays in the month, and in order to have further input from the Commission, the Subcommittee has limited its role to the report and recommendation set forth herein.